



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/820,264	04/08/2004	John P. Mullally	MUJ-104-A-1	7507
7590 Arnold S. Weintraub The Weintraub Group, P.L.C. Suite 240 32000 Northwestern Highway Farmington Hills, MI 48334				
EXAMINER WINTERBERG, NISSA M				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
1618				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
11/19/2008		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/820,264

Applicant(s)

MULLALLY, JOHN P.

Examiner

Nissa M. Westerberg

Art Unit

1618

Period for Reply -- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 21 August 2008.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1 - 7, 9 - 18, 20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 10 - 17 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1 - 7, 9, 18, 20 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☒ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/5508)
- Paper No(s)/Mail Date 8/21/08
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
- Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Inventor's Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Applicants' arguments, filed August 21, 2008, have been fully considered but they are not deemed to be fully persuasive. The following rejections and/or objections constitute the complete set presently being applied to the instant application.

Oath/Declaration

1. The oath or declaration is defective. A new oath or declaration in compliance with 37 CFR 1.67(a) identifying this application by application number and filing date is required. See MPEP §§ 602.01 and 602.02.

The oath or declaration is defective because:
Non-initialed and/or non-dated alterations have been made to the oath or declaration. See 37 CFR 1.52(c).

Priority

2. Applicant is not required to delete the benefit claims regarding the other action which do not support the concept of treating eye disease. This section was included for the purposes of identifying the effective filing date for the instant claims.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112 – 2nd Paragraph

3. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

4. Claims 2 – 9 and 20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Applicant has indicated on the record that the units “µcg” has the same meaning as “mcg”, units used in the medical realm for micrograms. Therefore, this rejection is WITHDRAWN.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

7. Claims 1 – 3, 5, 7, 18 and 19 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fleisch et al. (US 5,998,454) and Chang et al. (US 6,635,654) further in view of Weinstein et al. (US 6,521,254). This rejection is MAINTAINED for the reasons of record set forth in the Office Action mailed March 19, 2008 and those set forth below. Due to the amendments to the claims, this rejection is now applied to claims 1 – 3, 5, 7 and 18.

Applicant traverses this rejection because the general theory in medical practice is to reduce the number of medications prescribed to an individual as an increased number of medications to treat a single disorder is undesirable to the extent that the individual is exposed to an unnecessary increase in side effects. Fleisch even states that "overuse of corticosteroids has ominous side effects". Also, neither Fleisch nor Chang teach that C-reactive proteins in the body are reduced.

These arguments are not found to be persuasive. The decrease in C-reactive protein in the body is the mechanism, at least in part, by which these compounds exert their effect in the body. MPEP 2112 I states that "[T]he discovery of a previously unappreciated property of a prior art composition, or of a scientific explanation for the prior art's functioning, does not render the old composition patentably new to the discoverer." *Atlas Powder Co. v. Ireco Inc.*, 190 F.3d 1342, 1347, 51 USPQ2d 1943, 1947 (Fed. Cir. 1999). Thus the claiming of a new use, new function or unknown property which is inherently present in the prior art does not necessarily make the claim patentable. *In re Best*, 562 F.2d 1252, 1254, 195 USPQ 430, 433 (CCPA 1977). It is

noted that *In re Best* (195 USPQ 430) and *In re Fitzgerald* (205 USPQ 594) discuss the support of rejections wherein the prior art discloses subject matter which there is reason to believe inherently includes functions that are newly cited or is identical to a product instantly claimed. In such a situation the burden is shifted to the applicants to "prove that subject matter shown to be in the prior art does not possess characteristic relied on" (205 USPQ 594, second column, first full paragraph). Applicants have not presented any evidence that the compositions of the cited prior art, which administer the same classes of compounds, do not result in a decrease in C-reactive protein.

As to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time wishing to minimize the number of drugs administered, this is true, but as previously mentioned, the combined ingredients treat both symptoms and the underlying cause of the symptoms. Fleisch also only warns against the overuse of corticosteroids, not their use in general. So while it may be desirable to limit the number of drugs, one of ordinary skill would realize that administering more than one drug to treat not only the acute symptoms but also the underlying cause would outweigh the potential negative increase in side effects from the various medications.

8. Claims 1 – 5, 7 – 9 and 18 – 19 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fleisch et al., Chang et al. and Weinstein further in view of Down (US 2003/0096840) and Dal Negro (Pul Pharm Ther, 2003). This rejection is MAINTAINED for the reasons of record set forth in the Office Action mailed March 19, 2008 and those

set forth below. Due to the amendments to the claims, this rejection is now applied to claims 1 – 5, 7, 9 and 18.

Applicant traverse this rejection on the basis that as matter of law, the combination of any five references is not obvious and that none of these references disclose a decrease in C-reactive protein levels.

These arguments are not found to be persuasive. In response to applicant's argument that the examiner has combined an excessive number of references, reliance on a large number of references in a rejection does not, without more, weigh against the obviousness of the claimed invention. See *In re Gorman*, 933 F.2d 982, 18 USPQ2d 1885 (Fed. Cir. 1991).

The inherency of the cited prior art for decreasing the C reactive protein levels argument has been discussed in greater detail above.

9. Claims 1, 2, 6, 18 and 20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fleisch et al. Chang et al., Weinstein et al., Down and Dal Negro further in view of Bardsley et al. (US 6,677,326). This rejection is MAINTAINED for the reasons of record set forth in the Office Action mailed March 19, 2008 and those set forth below.

Applicant traverse this rejection on the basis that as matter of law, the combination of any six references is not obvious and that none of these references disclose a decrease in C-reactive protein levels.

These arguments are not found to be persuasive. In response to applicant's argument that the examiner has combined an excessive number of references, reliance on a large number of references in a rejection does not, without more, weigh against the obviousness of the claimed invention. See *In re Gorman*, 933 F.2d 982, 18 USPQ2d 1885 (Fed. Cir. 1991).

The inherency of the cited prior art for decreasing the C reactive protein levels argument has been discussed in greater detail above.

Conclusion

10. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Nissa M. Westerberg whose telephone number is (571)270-3532. The examiner can normally be reached on M - F, 8:00 a.m. - 4 p.m. ET.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Michael G. Hartley can be reached on (571) 272-0616. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Michael G. Hartley/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 1618

NMW